

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. First of all, Madam President, I apologize to everyone. I indicated to both the majority and the minority that we would be here at 5:30, but I had some things that came up, and I simply could not be here.

SERVICE MEMBERS HOME OWNER-SHIP TAX ACT OF 2009—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 175, H.R. 3590. I have a cloture motion that is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 175, H.R. 3590, the legislative vehicle for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Harry Reid, Christopher J. Dodd, Mark Udall, Patrick J. Leahy, Daniel K. Akaka, Richard J. Durbin, Sherrod Brown, Jeanne Shaheen, John F. Kerry, Jack Reed, Tom Harkin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Jeff Merkley, Joseph I. Lieberman, Barbara Boxer, Debbie Stabenow.

Mr. REID. I now withdraw that motion.

NEED FOR JUSTICE IN NEPAL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about a matter that is of concern to the Congress and the Department of State, involving a heinous crime that occurred in Nepal and the need for justice.

Many people are familiar with the brutal murder of Maina Sunuwar in February 2004. At the young age of 15, she was arrested by Nepali soldiers and severely tortured to death at, of all places, the Birendra Peace Operations Training Center. After her murder, the army made it look as though she had been shot while trying to escape, and then buried her body at the center.

According to a United Nations report, in September 2005, after intense public and international pressure, three army officers were brought before a court martial and sentenced to a mere 6 months imprisonment for failing to follow proper procedures when disposing of Maina's body. In spite of many requests, the Nepal army refused to disclose the nature of the charges that led to this sentence, or provide copies of any documents relating to the court of inquiry or court martial. It also refused to cooperate with police investigations.

It is shocking that one of the officers accused in her murder, Major Niranjana Basnet, was permitted to participate in a United Nations peacekeeping mission in Chad. This speaks volumes about the inadequacy of vetting procedures of military personnel for such missions, which is a separate subject that I intend to take up with officials at the Department of State and United Nations.

To his credit, Prime Minister Madhav Kumar Nepal had Major Basnet returned from Chad, following the issuance of an arrest warrant and in response to public calls for his arrest. However, when he arrived back at the Katmandu airport the army took him under its control and apparently, despite initial promises and requests from the police and orders from the Prime Minister, has still not handed him over to the police.

This case represents a critical juncture for Nepal. In large measure, and as others have pointed out, Maina's death will decide whether a civilian, democratic government and the rule of law will determine Nepal's future, or it will remain dominated by the interests of the Nepal army.

Just a few days ago, President Obama signed into law the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010, which includes a prohibition on assistance to the Nepal army unless it, among other things, is cooperating fully with investigations and prosecutions by civilian judicial authorities of violations of internationally recognized human rights. This provision applies squarely to Maina's case.

I urge the new Chief of the Army Staff, General Chhattaram Gurung, to seize this opportunity to demonstrate that the army is reforming, that it recognizes in a democracy its members are answerable to the civilian courts, and that it will no longer perpetuate the impunity that has undermined the rule of law in Nepal for far too long.

PAROLE GUIDELINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have long questioned the policy of detaining asylum seekers who present genuine claims for protection under our laws. Asylum seekers who express a fear of return to their country, and who can establish their identity and show that they are neither a flight risk nor a threat to the community, should be allowed to pursue a claim for relief in the United States free from custody. Yesterday, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, announced new guidelines for release of asylum seekers that override an unduly harsh policy implemented in 2007 by the Bush administration and that are a welcome step toward compliance with our obligations under the Refugee Convention.

Under current law, an asylum seeker who arrives at a port of entry and asks for refugee protection is given a brief interview to ascertain whether he or she has a credible fear of persecution in

their home country. If the asylum seeker passes that interview, they are detained, pending a hearing on their claim before an immigration judge. That hearing may take place weeks or months after the asylum seeker arrives in the United States. Unless the asylum seeker can convince the Department of Homeland Security that they should be released, that asylum seeker can spend those weeks or months in immigration detention. This policy is an affront to our ideals as a nation that aspires to be a beacon of light to persecuted refugees.

In 1997, the Immigration and Naturalization Service developed guidelines to determine whether asylum seekers should be released from custody in "parole" status while their asylum claims were adjudicated. To obtain parole, asylum seekers were required to establish their identity, and show that they were neither a flight risk nor a threat to the community. These guidelines were properly calibrated to deter fraud in the asylum system and threats to our national security. They also ensured that those who met the criteria for parole should be released. The 1997 parole guidelines were imperfectly implemented, but the policy contained in them was reasonable and appropriate.

For reasons that were never adequately explained, under the prior administration, ICE issued new parole guidelines that raised the bar for asylum seekers. In addition to the 1997 requirements, under the Bush policy, an asylum seeker had to demonstrate other factors, such as a serious medical condition, pregnancy, status as a minor, or that his or her release was in the "public interest." The term "public interest" was not defined in the 2007 guidelines and it is not clear how a detained asylum seeker could have met such a vague standard. Members of Congress and the bipartisan U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom questioned the need for such a restrictive policy, especially when many asylum seekers have no criminal record and pose no risk to Americans.

The new parole policy generally hews to the 1997 parole guidelines, but contains an important improvement. Again, asylum seekers will be eligible for parole if they demonstrate a credible fear of return to their country of origin, establish identity, and show that they are neither a flight risk nor a threat to the community. For the first time, however, the government will conduct a parole review of each case in which the asylum seeker establishes a credible fear of return. Under both the 1997 and 2007 policies, an asylum seeker had to request a parole determination in writing. Many asylum seekers arrive on our shores with genuine claims for protection, but no English language skills and no legal counsel. For these asylum seekers, navigating our complex immigration system presents an enormous hurdle. It is a challenge for them to even comprehend that they may seek parole